

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/766,272	01/28/2004	Thorsten Bechert	36403	3450	
116 PEARNE & G	7590 03/02/2007 ORDON LLP	EXAMINER			
1801 EAST 9TH STREET SUITE 1200 CLEVELAND, OH 44114-3108			STEPHENS, JACQUELINE F		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
022 ( 22.11 ( 2	, 0		3761		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/766,272	BECHERT ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Jacqueline F. Stephens	3761		

	Jacqueline F. Stephens	3761				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 February 2007</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS						
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in the same of the sam	Appeal. To avoid aba idavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)			
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	06.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b)	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u> 2.	sliance with 27 CER 41 27 must be	filed within two mont	as of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th				
AMENDMENTS		70 4 to 4 d 4-				
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause			
<ul> <li>(a)               ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co</li> <li>(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ul>		i E below),				
(c) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in being appeal; and/or		ducing or simplifying	the issues for			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).			
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>						
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:	☑ will not be entered, or b) ∐ wi vided below or appended.	II be entered and an	explanation of			
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>30-63</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u> 8.	it before or on the date of filing a N	otice of Anneal will no	nt he entered			
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	d sufficient reasons why the affidat	vit or other evidence i	s necessary and			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</li> </ol>	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attac	hed.			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		,			
13.  Other:		\ 1 t	1			
•		Jacqueline F Stepl	nens			

Rrimary Examiner Art Unit: 3761

Application No. 10/766,272

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claims 30 and 49 have been amended to include the limitations of claims 31 and 52, respectively. As stated in the Advisory Action mailed 1/16/07, the new combination of limitations changes the scope of the independent claims 30 and 49, (the dependent claims have been cancelled by way of the proposed amendment filed 2/8/07). However, the proposed amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance as Applicant repeats the argument that Hanke does not teach the presences of depressions in fiber outer surfaces, nor that the metallic silver is attached or bound to the fiber outer surface in the depressions. The examiner has previously rejected claims 31 and 52 by showing that Hanke teaches the sliver particles in a homogenous fluid matrix. Hanke also teaches coating or impregnating the silver-containing fluid matrix on the part of the body care product contacting the skin (paragraph 0023). Hanke further teaches the liquid pervious topsheet and/or the liquid impervious backsheet is coated with the fluid organic matrix containing homogeneously dispersed silver nanoparticles (paragraph 0026). As to the limitation of the depressions Hanke describes the topsheets as being apertured. Therefore, the absorbent article of Hanke comprises silver physically attached exclusively to the surface as claimed. Because the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive and amended claims do not place the application in condition for allowance, the amendment will not be entered.